

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 10, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claim 1 is amended. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 are currently pending for consideration, and claims 15-20 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as falling to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,063,339 to Tisone et al. (hereinafter "Tisone"). Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted art in view of Tisone.

The rejections of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Since Applicants have amended independent claim 1, Applicant believe the rejections are overcome and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tisone is respectfully

traversed and reconsideration is requested. The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted art in view of Tisone is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference at least in that this claim recites a combination of elements, including, for example, "supports above the table, the supports being formed in a bar shape to be extended in the direction of the column or line of the image display parts, the supports being separately parallel from each other." The cited references do not teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

As an initial matter, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Applicant's background art section as being applicant's admitted art. Applicant has not made any admissions regarding prior art, as the "Background of the Invention" merely explains some broad, general concepts about LCD panels and their conventional cutting techniques. However, merely for the sake of advancing prosecution, Applicant will refer to "applicant's admitted art" as per the Examiner's characterization.

As shown in Fig. 2 of Tisone, multiple dispensers 502 are disposed in parallel from each other and arrays of dispenser heads are spaced from each other. However, in Tisone the multiple dispensers 502 are merely disposed in parallel, not affixed to the support. Thus, Tisone fails to teach or suggest at least "supports above the table, the supports being formed in the bar shape to be extended in the direction of the column or line of the image display parts."

Further, applicant's admitted art merely discloses one support. On the contrary, in the claimed invention, a plurality of supports are disposed and the supports are separately parallel from each other. Thus, applicant's admitted art fails to teach or suggest at least "the supports being separately parallel from each other" as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 2-3, 5-9, 11-12 and 21, which depend directly and indirectly from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing Response places the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 3, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: */Valerie P. Hayes/*

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant